Santa Rosa County Local Mitigation Strategy (LMS) Task Force Steering Committee MAY 21, 2009 Milton, Florida

The Santa Rosa County LMS Task Force met on the above date. A copy of the sign-in sheet showing attendees is attached in the file. Hunter Walker, County Administrator, called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

Minutes for meeting held 04/16/09 were reviewed and approved as submitted.

Flood Mitigation Plan Consulting Proposals-Ranking

S. Harris stated that we received four (4) responses to the RFP. Her hope is that this committee will rank the proposals at this meeting in order to present our selection to the BOCC at their next meeting.

This project is being funded through the Hazard Mitigation Planning Grant in the amount of \$66,000; the county is responsible for a 25% match, which will be met with in-kind labor and materials. The balance of \$47,000 will pay for the consultant to assist with developing the plan.

- S. Harris advised H. Walker that there are no counties in the state that are completing the plan; she said, however, that there are some throughout the United States. It seems that there have been some problems writing these plans due to the level of difficulty of the new guidelines for the flood mitigation requirements.
- S. Bracewell suggested that, since Santa Rosa County has not completed a flood plan for the last ten to fifteen years, it would be best to place this portion of the plan (flood mitigation) with consultants. The LMS plan portion, however, could be completed in house. S. Harris stated that the flooding issues must be addressed and that, if completed in house, would not be as comprehensive.
- S. Harris stated that much of the staff will be involved in developing the plan; the consultant would be responsible for taking the lead in writing the plan, making presentation to the BOCC, attending public hearings, and providing expertise to the strategy of the plan.
- K. Thornhill looks forward to increasing our points while decreasing our class in our CRS rating with a clear and concise plan available for the related audits.
- S. Harris stated that our county attorney suggested that the proposals be reviewed by the Steering Committee and not a sub-committee.

Proposals were ranked by S. Harris in the following manner:

1.	CRS Max	\$37,500.00
2.	Salter's Creek	\$39,576.55**
3.	PBS & J	\$49,000.00
4.	MacTec	\$47,267.00

The out-of-town vendors ranked higher due to their level of experience with hazard mitigation. S. Harris reviewed the vendors' approach in relationship to Santa Rosa County; she reviewed their references and their ability to commit time to this project.

S. Harris' objective is to have a document that will provide her with a means to make decisions related to flood mitigation based on methods of prioritization, realizing that this is not a master plan. The plan will also be a tool to aid other departments within the county with data that will help them make determinations regarding many, many issues.

Discussion ensued regarding the consulting proposals, the purpose of the plan, the need to rank causes of repetitive losses, and developing criteria in order to make good decisions for the citizens of Santa Rosa County.

K. Thornhill reiterated that it is very difficult to prioritize or rank any problems that are brought to the county for mitigation or resolution. R. Blaylock suggested that a list of criteria be developed in order to be able to rank cases based on frequency of flooding, depth of flooding, etc. in each instance that is not able to be corrected as a routine matter of course.

Flooding issues were discussed; it was queried whether any actions are taken by the building inspections department, in order to reduce flooding or stop flooding in specific flood prone areas. The public outreach, as a part of this plan, prepares homeowners as to how the process works and that a funding match would most likely be a requirement.

- S. Harris pointed out that two of the proposals seemed to be engineering oriented and the other two leaned toward hazard mitigation. One of the proposals (Salter's Creek) included a disclosure, which the county attorney would most likely not allow. Discussion included several different rankings among the staff. D. Hahn recommended that we select the lowest bidder and make it a matter of economics. P. Miller pointed out that one of the proposals implied that a working committee (SRC?) would do most of the analysis.
- H. Walker explained that the normal procedure would be to present the proposals to the BOCC. The Board would then schedule interviews and at the same time we would ask for qualifications. H. Walker stated that this committee is not prepared to make a selection during this meeting. D. Szymanski suggested that we request each of the firms to do a presentation for this committee and include a question and answer forum.
- B. Watkins and D. Szymanski both indicated that they would be more comfortable with, and prefer a more local provider such as PBS & J.
- R. Blaylock and S. Furman were charged with reviewing the firms from an engineering point of view for ranking purposes.
- H. Walker would like to move forward, have the staff rank the proposals, make a selection, and provide to H. Walker along with perspectives and he will take the selection to the Board.

LMS Project Priority List

S. Harris grouped all projects together and provided Milton, Jay, and Gulf Breeze with a listing of their current data including current ranking. They are instructed to review each of the projects and rank accordingly.

This will be the first step to start the process and update the information. They should indicate any helpful information about each of the projects and add any justification for their needs. T. Gomillion reiterated that the LMS list will include some projects that are not eligible for HMGP funding.

HMGP Funding Allocation for Hurricane Gustav

S. Harris stated that no applications have been requested to date and the deadline for submission is June 29, 2009. Projects do not have to be on the initiative list; they can be added to the list. D. Hahn suggested we purchase and install river gauges. S. Harris will research that type of project, since the purpose would be early flood detection for warning systems.

D. Szymanski made a motion that river gauges be added to the project list. D. Hahn seconded the motion and the **motion carried**. S. Bracewell to get with S. Harris to develop this project.

LMS Plan Update

S. Bracewell stated that the initial thought was that the update to this plan would be fairly simple; that the plan would be to update old information to a current status.

It is clear that the state is looking for much more; they want history, they want to know exactly why available funds were not spent, they want to know the status of each project, they want the plan to coincide with the Comp plan, the land use management plan, etc.

It has come to the attention of staff members that the LMS Plan should (and most appropriately) fall under planning and zoning in order to be maintained more accurately. P. Miller willingly agreed to take on the plan in order to meet the November deadline. B. Faulkenberry will oversee the project. S. Harris will continue to maintain the initiative list. P. Bowman, GIS, will provide mapping.

- S. Bracewell has discovered at different workshops that Santa Rosa County is not as active as many other counties; we do not involve the citizens as we should and we need to make some changes and improvements to the LMS.
- T. Gomillion stated that more citizen involvement will most likely require more meetings to include citizens, which will then require more preparation time, staff hours, etc. In order to include more citizens, overtime or flex time will be required on the part of the staff. Some employees are already working at night. The result is that when those employees flex that time during regular hours, they are not around for regular meetings.
- S. Bracewell suggested that citizen awareness/contact could be improved with LMS related pamphlets, brochures, an LMS web page, a public comment section

and planning and zoning town hall-type meetings could incorporate better LMS related citizen involvement.

Other Business/Public Comment None

Next Meeting Date/Adjournment

The next meeting is scheduled for July 16, 2009 at 1:30 p.m. in the Public Services media room.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the committee at this time, the meeting adjourned.

Chairman